

Terminal Disclaimer in the event the rejection is ultimately maintained but the claims are found otherwise allowable. Applicants also point out that should the present claims issue prior to the claims identified by the Examiner, any need to file a Terminal Disclaimer would, in the Applicants' opinion, be obviated.

All of claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Derzay et al. The Derzay et al. reference does not anticipate the pending claims because the reference does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in the claims.

Claim 1 and Its Dependent Claims

In particular, claim 1 recites *inter alia*, "identifying a standard service function from a plurality of service functions" and "accessing data stored at the medical diagnostic station as defined by the standard service function." The standard service functions recited in claim 1 correspond to the various functions provided in menus in the embodiment described in the present application. In particular, it was found that in systems such as that disclosed by Derzay et al., open-ended service requests could be streamlined significantly by the provision of standard service functions, such as in menu formats in graphical user interfaces. Such standard functions are described in the application at numerous locations, such as on page 9, lines 6-20; page 9, beginning on line 30, through line 12 of page 10; and on page 11, from line 13 through line 31. The menus of standard service requests are also illustrated in the figures, as indicated by reference numeral 100 in Fig. 2, and in Fig. 4.

On the contrary, the Derzay et al. system, while permitting service requests to be composed and submitted, does not provide standard service functions as presently claimed. In particular, as illustrated in Fig. 8 of Derzay et al., a service request page on a browser permits a problem description to be identified in an open fashion (see reference numeral 212). Thus, the Derzay et al. reference simply does not describe or suggest the use of standard service functions as recited in claim 1. Claim 1, and the claims depending

therefrom are therefore believed to be clearly allowable over Derzay et al. Their consideration and allowance are requested.

Claim 8 and Its Dependent Claims

Claim 8, in a manner similar to claim 1, recites an automated service facility that includes a server that is configured to “execute a plurality of predefined service functions.” The recited field service unit, then, transmits service requests to the automated service facility “including identification of a predefined service function.” Again, these predefined service functions are the standard service functions described in the application, such as those presented in the menus of the graphical user interface described.

As noted above, Derzay et al. simply do not provide for predefined service functions that can be selected and transmitted from a field service unit. Thus, Derzay et al. cannot anticipate claim 8 or the claims depending therefrom. Reconsideration of these claims are requested.

Claim 16 and Its Dependent Claims

Independent claim 16, similarly, recites a method that includes composing a service request, the service request including “identification of a service function from a plurality of predefined service functions.” The method also includes accessing operational data “as defined by the at least one service function.” As noted above, Derzay et al. do not provide for predefined service functions that can be selected in the manner recited in claim 16, or used as a basis for accessing operational data as defined by the claim. Claim 16, and the claims depending therefrom, are therefore believed to be clearly allowable over the cited reference.